



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

TA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/210,638	12/11/98	BAYER	M ATUS4630

MM12/0813

JOSEPH V COPPOLA
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER
1533 NORTH WOODARD AVENUE
SUITE 140
BLOOMFIELD HILLS MI 48304

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED:

08/13/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/210638

Applicant(s)

Bayer

Examiner

Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

Abstract objected to;

numerals in parenthesis should be added, see Ostrem patent, some sentences to the claims 4, 5, 6 features should also be added.

Fig. 1, a numerals 104 for the wires should be added in region of pins 108 to more clearly depict the position of the wires on the pins. The wires might also be more clearly shown folded over the pins by use of added lines as in Soviet Union patent.

Fig. 2 is objected to as unclear and inconsistent with Fig. 1. Correlation between the figures is inadequate, where is pin 108, wire 104? The secondary bobbin is not seen, the wire portion 112 is not shown to be related to wire 104 as best understood. Fig. 3 is similarly unclear and fails to aid the reader in determining the nature of the invention. If a top plan view is to be included, it should be redone to include the plate with holes 106 and the pins 108 shown as small circles on such plate. Complete revision of these figs. is suggested, but note the prohibition on new matter. The coil depictions in figs. 1, 2 are further confusing in that such coils are typically shown with pins directed downwardly as in the cited references. Revision of the drawings is suggested.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the claims 4, 5, 6, 7 features, as best understood must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

For claim 6, both the O-ring and silica gel features must be shown.

Art Unit: 2839

Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

The disclosure is objected to under 35 USC 112 as being confusing and inadequate with respect to the fig. 2 device both as to structure and purpose of the features 116, 118.

Claims 4, 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. These claims are based on a confusing and non-enabling disclosure, both to structure and function (purpose) of the claimed features. Just why secondary bobbins and seals are used is unclear. Also see objections to drawings and spec.

Claims 4, 5, 6, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are confusingly expressed. Terms "bobbin formed over the wire" are unclear. Claim 6 dependency seems incorrect, compare to claim 5. Further, for claim 6, the seals are only disclosed with respect to the fig. 2 assembly.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hildebrandt alone or taken in view of Soviet Union (50), Weidler Olsen, Ostrem and IBM.

Art Unit: 2839

Term "solderless" should not overcome the Hildebrandt disclosure since it would have been obvious to retain the wires to the pins without solder in view of SU (as best understood), Olsen and Weidler. The Hildebrandt device is for use with a circuit board. Such type of use further suggested Ostrem and IBM. Term "distal end" does not define over Hildebrand device. For example in fig. 2 lower portions or halves of pins could be read as "distal ends". Also obvious that Hildebrand pins with wires could be plugged into sockets in a pcb in a manner like that shown by Weidler or as would be the obvious use of the SU device. Claims 4-7 features recited without indication of function would be obvious variations.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostrem in view of IBM and Hildebrandt.

Obvious to form Ostrem pins for friction fit in pcb holes in view of IBM. The wires 117, see fig. 3, at lower end are read as at distal end of pin. For claim 2, obvious to form Ostrem device with holes for wires in view of Hildebrandt at 16 and to pre-tin wires in view of Hildebrandt.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross in view of Hildebrandt.


It would have been obvious to omit solder use and to rely on pressure for electrical connection of wires 20, 48 to pads. Also obvious to use other material such as conductive adhesive, which is well known in place of solder. Also obvious to pre-tin wires in view of Hildebrandt.

Application/Control Number: 09/210,638

Page 5

Art Unit: 2839

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at
telephone number (703) 308-1729.


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2839

Abrams/dc
August 6, 1999